DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 223 251 IR 050 004

AUTHOR Basefsky, Stuart Mark
TITLE Bibliographic Citations and U.S. Government Publications: A Conceptual Analysis and Comparison of Style Manuals.
PUB DATE Dec 79
NOTE 46p.; M.L.S. Thesis, University of North Carolina. Appendix p.la and lb will not reproduce.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Master Theses (042)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Abstracts; *Citations (References); Databases; *Government Publications; Indexes; Information Retrieval; Microforms; Online Systems
IDENTIFIERS *Document Location; *Style Manuals; Unpublished Materials

ABSTRACT

The author presents a conceptual analysis of the role of bibliographic citations in the control and retrieval of U.S. government publications, and a factual examination of citation forms for government documents as prescribed by eight major style manuals. A discussion of the general purpose of bibliographic citations and the relationship between their style and content, with content defined as the information needed to identify, distinguish, and locate documents, precedes comparisons between style manuals on the basis of their general statements on citation content and their specific directions for citation of government documents. Four inadequacies of citation formats for government documents as recommended by style manuals are identified, including their emphasis on style rather than adequate location content, their neglect of information referring to abstracting and indexing tools for the retrieval of government documents, their disregard of new document formats such as microforms and online database records, and their omission of information leading to unpublished or difficult-to-retrieve material. Further deficiencies of style manuals are reviewed and a statement of citation content for government documents emphasizing ease of location is suggested. An appendix provides specific citation examples for a congressional committee print and a bill. A nine-item bibliography concludes the publication. (ESR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED223251

BIBLIOGRAPHIC CITATIONS AND U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS:

A CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON OF STYLE MANUALS

By

Stuart Mark Basefsky

A master's paper submitted to the faculty
of the School of Library Science of the
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Science in
Library Science

Chapel Hill

December, 1979

Approved by:

Adviser

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Stuart M. Basefsky

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

I-R050004

STUART MARK BASEFSKY. Bibliographic Citations and U.S. Government Publications: A Conceptual Analysis and Comparison of Style Manuals. A master's paper for the M.S. in L.S. degree. December, 1979. 40 pages. Adviser: R. Kessler.

This paper focuses on the problems of bibliographic control and retrieval of U.S. Government Publications which are revealed through footnote and bibliography references. Because these bibliographic citations usually result from the application of citation rules provided by style manuals, eight well-known and often used style manuals are thoroughly scrutinized and compared on the basis of their treatment of U.S. Government Documents.

Since little background material exists on this subject, a conceptual analysis of the purpose of citation forms is developed based on concerns expressed by the style manuals themselves.

Major flaws are found in all of the style manuals examined. Suggestions for improvement are made.

Headings:

Bibliographical citations

Bibliographical control

Documentation

Government publications

Information retrieval

Style manuals

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. CONSIDERATIONS IN CITING GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS 3

A. GENERAL PURPOSE OF CITATION 3

B. STYLE VS. CONTENT 5

C. GENERAL PURPOSE OF CITATION FOR GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS 7

III. CITATION CONTENT CONSIDERATIONS FOR U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS 8

A. PURPOSE OF CONTENT 8

1. COMPARISON OF STATEMENTS ON CONTENT 8

2. WHAT IS "COMMON SENSE" IN CHOOSING CITATION CONTENT? 17

3. WHAT IS ACCESS AND HOW IS IT MADE EASY? 18

B. NEED FOR GENERAL STATEMENTS OR GUIDELINES 19

1. PURPOSE OF GENERAL STATEMENTS OR GUIDELINES 20

2. GUIDELINES AND DIFFICULT DECISIONS 21

a. MICROFORMS, NEW FORMATS, COMPUTER ACCESS 21

b. UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL AND HARD TO GET MATERIAL 26

C. WHAT DOES ALL THIS MEAN FOR U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS? 27

IV. CONGRESSIONAL PUBLICATIONS: comparing citations for content and accessibility 28

A. WHY CONGRESSIONAL PUBLICATIONS? 28

B. BASIS OF COMPARISON 28

C. THE RESULTS 29

V. SUGGESTION FOR A GENERAL STATEMENT OF CITATION CONTENT 32

VI. CONCLUSION 33

APPENDIX

NOTES

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. INTRODUCTION

As information increases and the formats in which it appears change, emphasis has been placed on bibliographic control and retrieval through the creation of new indexes (these include conventional indexes and abstracts, computer stored and retrieved data bases, etc.) which keep track of this proliferation. This is particularly true of U.S. Government Publications which are now tracked by publishers (governmental and commercial) too numerous to mention.

These developments are long overdue. They generate excitement and feelings of gratitude on the part of documents librarians and researcher/patrons. Unfortunately, better and more indexing--regardless of the technologies used--is only one part of bibliographic control and retrieval. Overlooked in the enthusiasm for new indexes and new document formats are bibliographic citation forms for footnotes and bibliographies. After all, aside from indexes and abstracts, knowledge of a document's existence can come from having seen the document previously, from word-of-mouth, or from footnote and bibliography references.

Knowing that a specific document exists (control) is different from having information which permits retrieval of that document. If knowledge of a document comes from an index that provides the material indexed (i.e., CIS), then retrieval is easy (i.e., for CIS, a microfiche accession number is provided). On the other hand, if knowledge comes from a footnote found in some report, the content

of that footnote determines how easily the document can be retrieved, if at all.

This paper focuses on the problems of bibliographic control and retrieval of U.S. Government Publications which are revealed through footnote and bibliography references. To examine these problems eight style manuals were scrutinized and compared with regard to their treatment of U.S. Government Documents:

Brightbill, George D. and Maxson, Wayne C. Citation Manual for United States Government Publications. Philadelphia: Center for the Study of Federalism, Temple University, 1974. (also ERIC, ED 103 027) [Hereinafter referred to as Citation Manual].

The Columbia Law Review, The Harvard Law Review Association, The University of Pennsylvania Law Review, and The Yale Law Journal. A Uniform System of Citation, 12th ed. Cambridge, Mass.: The Harvard Law Review Association, 1976. [Hereinafter referred to as A Uniform System of Citation].

A Manual of Style, 12th ed., rev. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969. [Hereinafter referred to as Chicago].

Modern Language Association. MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations, New York: Modern Language Association, 1977. [Hereinafter referred to as MLA].

Turabian, Kate L. A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations, 4th ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973. [Hereinafter referred to as Turabian (A Manual)].

Turabian, Kate L. Student's Guide for Writing College Papers, 3d ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976. [Hereinafter referred to as Turabian (Student's Guide)].

U.S. Government Printing Office. U.S. Government Printing Office Style Manual, rev. ed. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1973. (also MC 73-25363; GP 1.23/4: St 9/973) [Hereinafter referred to as GPO] .

U.S. Library of Congress. Reference Department. General Reference and Bibliography Division. Bibliographical Procedures & Style, by Blanche Prichard McCrum and Helen Dudenbostel Jones. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1954. (also MC 54-10651; LC 2.8: B 47/954) [Hereinafter referred to as LC].

In the process, several considerations and questions were necessarily raised (outlined in the Table of Contents) by one or several of the style manuals.

This paper is both a factual examination of citation forms and a conceptual analysis of the role of bibliographic citations in the control and retrieval of U.S. Government Publications. Since little or nothing has been written on this subject, the style manuals themselves (with few exceptions) serve as a bibliography of the ideas herein contained. Otherwise my experiences in working as a documents librarian intern (in Wilson Library at the University of North Carolina--Chapel Hill) serve as a basis for comment on the relative adequacies of the style manuals.

II. CONSIDERATIONS IN CITING GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

A. GENERAL PURPOSE OF CITATION

It is generally acknowledged that reference/authority citations in footnote or bibliographic form have at least three functions.

1) They identify who or what is the source of summary, paraphrase, direct quotation, or any combination thereof used in some format of presentation. This includes the "borrowing" of any facts, ideas, and opinions.[1]

2) They describe the source in a manner which distinguishes it from other or similar references.[2]

3) They reveal, in description, information which can be used to relocate the source should the reader need it for any reason.[3]

Outwardly it appears that bibliographic citation should be a simple matter of creating a form that provides all three functions. Unfortunately, there is a great diversity of sources--among these are books, periodicals, pamphlets, lectures, films, microforms, computer tapes, and government documents (which appear in every imaginable format). Each type of source presents the problem of matching form with function. As yet, the publishing world and academia (the two groups with the most interest in this problem) have not agreed or standard forms of citation for this variety of formats. Consequently citation style manuals have evolved instructing writers, researchers, students, and professors how to fulfill three functions in an acceptable form.

Apparently to be acceptable a form must meet two criteria. First, it must be a form recommended by a manual. Second, the manual must be recommended by the group(s) soliciting the research.

If one recognizes the aforementioned as a straightforward, proper description of the concerns surrounding bibliographic citation, a purpose emerges. The logic takes the following form:

If A) There is agreement that there are at least the three mentioned functions of bibliographic citation.

B) These functions primarily serve the reader.

C) Publishers and academic interest groups among others, in order to serve better their reading public, create, choose or recommend manuals to prescribe citation forms.

D) Writers and researchers follow these recommendations in order to please publishers who wish to please readers.

Then

> The purpose of bibliographic citation is to serve the reading public by identifying sources in such a manner that they can be distinguished from other references and relocated for whatever reason the reader may have.

This less than shocking conclusion may seem obvious beyond mention. However, librarians repeatedly confront poor or indecipherable citations from reputable sources, frustrated patrons who bear these inadequate notes, and the hostility that emanates from the frustration.

For whatever reason, the goal of serving the reading public is not being met often enough. Bibliographic citations do confound and confuse--not only their intended audience but librarians as well.

B. STYLE VS. CONTENT

Part of the confusion is a result of not clearly understanding the relationship between the style of a bibliographic citation and the content of that citation.

Style, as implied by its use in style manuals, is a publishing term. It refers to the technical rules regarding the mechanics of writing.[4] These rules may include spacing, punctuation, abbreviations, capitalization, etc. In other words, style manuals are how-to-do-books or, more specifically, how-to-please-the-publisher/printer books. If one wishes to publish, he or she is requested to follow the "house style" or "press style" of the publisher. Style rules are not hard and fast universal printing standards. They are merely

recommended formats by publishers. Because some of these publishers serve a special reading clientele, they require (so they think) a special style manual to accommodate, presumably, the reading demands of their public. Style, in this sense, has nothing to do with literary style, writing style, or any way of presenting material subject to value judgments.

Style in bibliographic citations, therefore, refers to punctuation, spacing, the ordering of information (author; then title; then publisher, etc.), or any aspect of the citation's technical composition. No value judgments are to be made. If the writer has the necessary bibliographic information, he or she must place it in proper order, with prescribed punctuation, and in accordance with any other rules outlined in the manual being utilized.

Content, on the other hand, is the information contained in the citation. Regardless of the presentation format, it is the content that enables the reader to identify, distinguish, and relocate the source.

Unfortunately, style manuals tend to construe content as that information which fulfills two conditions:

1) The content of the citation must conform with the rules of the style manual which may be indicated in three ways. The manual may A) state that the information is required; B) imply by example that the information must be used; C) state that the inclusion of the information is optional.

2) The information necessary to meet the requirements of the first condition must be available to the writer.

Presumably if information is not available in conformity with

the style rules, incomplete citations will result. This will occur even if other non-conforming information is available that would clearly identify, distinguish, and relocate the source. (This is discussed in detail in a following section.)

Viewed in this manner, content obviously serves whatever functions the style may have. In other words, style dictates content. All this leads one to believe that two assumptions are being made by the writers and sponsors of style manuals.

1) A special citation style will best serve a specific reading clientele, i.e., the citation style of the Uniform System of Citation for lawyers.

2) This is true because the content demanded by the style fulfills, by design, the purpose of bibliographic citation--"identifying sources in such a manner that they can be distinguished from other references and relocated for whatever reason the reader may have."

Although these assumptions work well most often, they fail at one point with some regularity. The content of the bibliographic citation does not always permit the relocation of the source. This is particularly true for U.S. Government Publications. (This is discussed in detail in a following section).

C. GENERAL PURPOSE OF CITATION FOR GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

Certainly the general purpose of bibliographic citation applies to U.S. Government Publications. However, researchers and librarians (nearly all documents users) agree that these documents deserve special attention because of one major difficulty. They are usually harder to locate than other materials.[5] In fact once

located, these documents are often more troublesome to relocate. In part, this tracking problem results from 1) inadequate or complicated bibliographic research tools; 2) little understanding of how to properly use what tools are available; 3) poor distribution and availability of U.S. Government Publications; and, 4) unsatisfactory citation formats. The assertion made here is that purposeful and rational bibliographic citations for documents would diminish all these difficulties considerably.

What is a purposeful and rational bibliographic citation for U.S. Government Documents? It is citation content, not necessarily style, that puts extra emphasis on the location of the source.

III. CITATION CONTENT CONSIDERATIONS FOR U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

A. PURPOSE OF CONTENT

Having determined, thus far, what the purpose of citation is for U.S. Government Publications, the content of citation becomes well-defined. Content is information which permits the reader to identify, distinguish, and particularly in the case of U.S. Documents, LOCATE the source. With this understanding, two questions follow:

1) Do the existing citation manuals recognize the need for content which emphasizes location?

2) If so, do they provide for this additional information in the suggested citation formats? (see IV).

1. COMPARISON OF STATEMENTS ON CONTENT

In answer to the first question, Turabian (Student's Guide) acknowledges the definite need to emphasize location in the biblio-

graphic citation. This manual goes so far as to recommend including too much information rather than too little.

> Public documents are of many kinds, and no one style of reference is suitable for all. Whatever the form, it should be one that would make it easy to locate the reference. When in doubt of how much to include in a reference to a public document, remember that it is better to have too much than too little. The "author' is usually the name of a country... together with the name of the legislative body, court, executive department, bureau, board, commission, or committee responsible for the work.[6]

It is not certain, however, whether the information should first complement the easy location of material or conform to a chosen style. This is an important distinction since the best information for locating a document might be the entry number of the Monthly Catalog (or other types of locating information) for which the manual makes no provision. This particularly in light of the statement at 4:6.

> There is, to be sure, more than one acceptable style of making footnote and bibliographic references. But an examination of the references will show that they follow a consistent style throughout. And so also must your research paper, whatever the approved style you may adopt.[7]

Since the demands of style may not be consistent with the purpose of content, the best locating information can be deleted from a citation. At least, this is the situation that Turabian (Student's Guide) sets up.

Turabian (A Manual) recognizes, too, the need to emphasize location. However, location is restricted within a library. This is curious since most libraries have very limited collections of government documents. Does Turabian (A Manual) mean "location" to be finding a bibliographic reference or actually retrieving the document? The answer is not clear. The manual's reference to

the use of the card catalog can be helpful if the library catalogs its documents. Why the manual does not mention government provided catalogs, which are more likely to have the information, is a strange oversight.

> The form used for citing public documents should be one that makes them readily accessible to anyone wishing to locate them in a library. The arrangement of information on the title pages of the documents themselves, its amount, and its complexity raise puzzling questions of how much of the information it is necessary to include and in what order it should be set down in the footnote. Here reference to the card catalog of the library can be of great help, although it is not a safe guide in such matters as capitalization and punctuation of titles, which for public documents as well as for other references must follow the scheme of the paper. When in doubt of how much to include in a reference, it is better to err on the side of giving too much rather than too little information.[8] [underlining added]

This manual's guidelines for content are fixed to the concept of style order also.

> The name of the country...(e.g., U.S. ...) is given first in the citation of an official publication issued by [it] ...or under its auspices. Then comes the name of the legislative body, court, executive department, bureau, board, commission, or committee. The name of the office rather than the title of the officer should be given.... The name of the division, regional office, etc., if any, follows the name of the department, bureau, or commission. Thus the "author" of document might read: U.S., Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research. Following the name of the author, the title of the document, if any, should be given. From this point, the information noted is dependent largely upon the nature of the material.[9]

Curiously, after mentioning that it is better to include more information rather than less, the manual indicates that in most instances the "facts of publication" should not be included in the citation. That is to say, the citation should exclude the place of publication, the name of the publishing agency, and the date of the publication.

> Generally speaking, references to public documents do not include the facts of publication. When, however, the document has a personal author whose name is included (as it should be) in the reference, it is best to show the facts of publication. For some such references the date of publication may be the only clue to the date of the work (see par. 9:7, n.5).[10]

If one continues to follow these instructions (since "some such references" are not identified as to type or kind) by examining par. 9:7, n.5, one concludes that had not Robert J. Lampman or any other personal author been responsible for this Committee Print, no place, publisher's name, or date would have been given. Thus the result--

> U.S., Congress, Joint Economic Committee, The Low-Income Population and Economic Growth, Joint Committee Print, Study Paper 12, pp. 14-15. [clearly inadequate]

from an otherwise adequate citation example originally reading as follows:

> U.S., Congress, Joint Economic Committee, The Low-Income Population and Economic Growth, by Robert J. Lampman, Joint Committee Print, Study Paper 12 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1959), pp. 14-15.[11]

Contradicting these instructions, however, is the Basic Style note--

> Basic Style. The first time a work is mentioned in a footnote, the entry should be in complete form; that is, it should include not only the author's full name, the title of the work, and the specific reference (i.e., volume, if any, and page number), but the facts of publication as well.[12] [second underlining added]

Again, the demands of style conflict with the purpose of content and no certainty is evinced about the meaning of location. There is also doubt about what is an appropriate style.

Chicago, too, makes the definitive statement that location is the ultimate aim of bibliographic citation for government documents.

However, like Turabian (A Manual), this manual limits location to a library situation. While guidelines for content are tied to the concept of style order, some clarification is given on how the nature of a document can determine what additional content should be included. Why this difference in content is necessary, however, is not mentioned.

> The purpose of using a particular form of citation for public documents is to make them accessible to anyone wishing to locate them in a library. Most large institutional libraries in the United States subscribe to the National Union Catalog: A Cumulative Author List Representing Library of Congress Printed Cards and Titles Submitted by Other American Libraries and to the Library of Congress printed card service. Accordingly, it is most sensible for authors to conform to the Library of Congress form of citation except in matters of capitalization and punctuation. This form requires the following order of information. First, the country...(for example, United States...) issuing the document; second, the legislative body, executive department, court, bureau, board, commission, or committee; and third, any further division, regional office, etc.[13] [underlining added]

> Following the information about the "author" or issuing agent, the title of the document or collection of documents should be given. The remainder of the citation is largely determined by the nature of the document. For example, the Congressional Record requires the number of the Congress, the session, the year, the volume, sometimes the part, and the page number, but no facts of publication; reports require document or report numbers in addition to the Congress and session; and reports prepared by individual persons for the government require those persons' names and facts of publication.[14]

> For documents not falling in any of the catagories illustrated, the general principles given at the beginning of the chapter (par. 17.1-2) plus common sense should suggest logical forms.[15] [underlining added]

The Citation Manual unequivocally states that location is the proper focus of citation for government documents.

> We take the premise that the citations are intended not only to indicate sources, but to be useful in identifying those sources sufficiently for the reader to locate them with a minimum amount of difficulty.[16]

This manual hastens to add, however,

> At the same time, there ought to be a rationale for every part of the citation, and it is our hope that we have provided this rationale.[17]

Unfortunately, the authors of this manual do not clarify what they mean by rationale. Certainly they do not answer how additional bits of information help "...the reader locate [documents] with a minimum amount of difficulty." This may indeed be the end result, but the reason is not explained. Content statements are attached to specific examples of different types of documents in this manual.

The Uniform System of Citation makes no statement concerning the purpose of citation. The reader must rely on specific examples to guide his or her choice of style and content. If the reader must cite a document for which there is no example, or a non-standard document, citation becomes an unreasoned art.

GPO, too, makes no statement concerning the purpose of citation. In fact, this manual claims to have no authority in advising how to cite government publications, although it is the government's style manual. It simply states,

> There are many styles available to bibliographers, for there are many classes of documents. A Government bulletin citation, according to one authority, would be treated as follows:
>
> Author's name (if the article is signed); title of article (in quotation marks); the publication (usually in italic), with correct references to volume, number, series, pages, date, and publisher (U.S. Govt. Print. Off.).[18]

Therefore the example would read:

> U.S. Department of the Interior, "Highways in history of forest and related natural source conservation," Conservation Bulletin, No. 41 (serial number not italic), Washington, U.S. Dept. of the Interior (or U.S. Govt. Print. Off.), 1966. 1 p. (or p. 1).[19]
>
> ...The science of bibliography is covered in many texts, and the following references are available for study.[20]

Six style manuals are referred to, two of which are reviewed in this paper.

The GPO reminds its users in the preface,

> For the purposes of the MANUAL, printed examples throughout are to be considered the same as the printed rules.[21]

Does this last statement mean that the government bulletin citation above contains in it a format rule which should guide content choice?

The MLA indicates that the general purpose of citation applies to government publications as well. No special emphasis is mentioned for U.S. Documents.

> The conventions of documentation are a means to an end: to lend authority and credibility to your work and to enable the reader to locate sources with ease.[22]

The MLA goes on to say,

> Government publications are numerous, and their citation in notes and bibliography can be a complicated matter. In general, in citing a government document, indicate the agency first. (If, however, the name of an author is known, it may be given first or, if the agency is listed first, placed after the title and preceded by a comma and the word "by"; see sample notes 54 and 55.) The name of the agency may be abbreviated if the context makes it clear.... The title of the publication ...should follow immediately. In citing a Congressional document other than the Congressional Record (which requires only date and page number), include such information as the number and session of Congress, the house (S. or H.R.), and the type and number of publication. Types of Congressional publications include bills (S. 33; H.R. 77), resolutions (S. Res. 20; H. Res. 50), reports (S. Rept. 9; H. Rept. 142), and documents (S. Doc. 333; H. Doc. 222). The usual publishing information comes next (i.e., place, publisher, date). Most federal publications, regardless of the branch of government, are published by the Government Printing Office (GPO) in Washington, D. C.....[23]

LC makes no special exceptions for documents. This manual simply states that "...references...require description in clear, consistent, and correct entries that result in ready identification

of individual items."[24] Apparently, LC assumes that the detail it requires will also result in easy location. LC does, however, recognize a content problem in citing government documents.

> The citation of a document contains the same elements that are essential to the description of books, pamphlets and other monographic publications. However, the complexities of documents, mainly because of their origin and form, result in complicated author headings and involved series notes.[25]

This manual then provides content instructions for documents within a style order framework. This is illustrated by specific examples of different types of documents. No explanation of how this content benefits the reader is given.

What conclusions can be made thus far in answer to the first question?

1) Five of the eight manuals recognize, at least in part, the need for citation content to emphasize location. The Uniform System of Citation, GPO, and LC fail to mention this need as an express purpose of bibliographic citation for government documents. Whether or not this need is implied by these three manuals is a question that can be answered by actual use of their citation forms for locating documents (See IV. Here too, the other manuals are tested to see if they do as they intend).

2) Those manuals that do acknowledge the need for citations to focus on location concur on a most peculiar perspective of content. These manuals see content serving a particular order of priorities: Content serves first the purpose of style. Content serves second the purpose of identification and location. In both cases, the reader is served--but with qualitative differences.

Before explaining these differences, it is necessary to trace the "logic" that results in content taking on this special meaning:

A) The content of a citation, if proper, will help locate the reference for the reader.

B) But, the reader [it is assumed], not wanting complicated and unintelligible information in a citation will be content to indulge some complexities if the information follows some agreed to standard presentation.

C) Therefore, the publisher/printer and/or interest group(s)--who also dislike complexity--must provide for stylized presentations of information (i.e., the style manual) in order to meet readers' needs.

D) Recognizing that stylized presentation forms may exclude some content (because some information may not fall within the delineations of the style), the style is designed to incorporate that content which will provide <u>adequate</u> [or so it is thought] location information, though not necessarily the best location information.

E) Consequently, the style will dictate the information permissible within a citation.

F) However, exceptions are provided for if 1) location problems are anticipated because of the nature of the material; and, 2) the additional information can be incorporated in a manner consistent with the general principles or guidelines of the style.[26]

The possible result: The reader, for whom all this is done, can identify and distinguish the source cited. But, locating the source becomes a question of style. If the style dictates good [locating] content, then location is easy. Conversely, poor [non-locating or inappropriate] content makes location difficult if

not impossible in terms of time and cost.

Herein lies the qualitative difference. Content that is directly tied to locating a source--for example, an ERIC accession number--provides for quick and easy location. But, content indirectly tied to locating a source--because it must conform first to style--may or may not provide good locating information. For example, some style manuals make no mention of microforms (of the eight examined here only Turabian (A Manual) does). The result can be that the researcher/writer cites to what appears to be a hard copy that is in fact available in microfiche only. Providing that the citation is good, the reader would have to take at least the one extra step, if not several, of acquiring the microfiche accession number.

Some authors or sponsors of style manuals, at this point, would quickly state that nothing prevents the researcher/writer from adding appropriate information within the general principles of the style. Any additional steps necessary to locate sources could be adequately dealt with within the context of the style guidelines. Furthermore, common sense would dictate the inclusion of this information.[27]

2. WHAT IS "COMMON SENSE" IN CHOOSING CITATION CONTENT?

If "common sense" has to conform to the general principles of any given style manual, then "common sense" will not be "common" to any or all manuals. This, of course, assumes that the general principles of style manuals vary, at least slightly.

Viewed separately from the demands of style, "common sense"

takes on meaning, however. In this context, content is directly linked with location. "Common sense," therefore, can be defined as follows: Choosing content which identifies, distinguishes, and locates a source in a manner that would have made access easy for the researcher/writer about to cite the material in question. In other words, include information that would be helpful in relocating the material. "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." Make access easy!

3. WHAT IS ACCESS AND HOW IS IT MADE EASY?

Access is retrieving material. There is no one way of finding sources because access is dependent on tools--bibliographic tools. Without these tools, locating material is nearly impossible. The typical reader is not expected to be aware of all the tools available for accessing references. The style manuals assume, however, that the reader will make use of whatever information is made available in a citation to access material. How the reader will accomplish this is not discussed. Occasional mention of card catalogs (which require author, title, or subject information) or periodical indexes (which require author, title, or subject, and date) is made in the various manuals with the expectation that readers are acquainted with their use. Otherwise the numerous unmentioned bibliographic tools and the librarians who specialize in their use are overlooked. In fact, librarians have no apparent or measurable input into the process of style manual development. After all, style manuals are the result of the interaction among readers, writers, and publishers--with the focus on readers. Librarians are left out entirely. This

is unfortunate because librarians know how to make access easy. It is a five step process.

A) Have in hand what is to be cited.

B) List the bibliographic tools (including computers) that can (or are likely to) be used to access the material.

C) Determine what information is necessary to use these tools so that they will lead directly to the source (author, title, date, etc.)

D) Determine what information, if recognizable (perhaps a CIS accession number), will permit the bypassing of the bibliographic tools and provide immediate access (i.e., pull the fiche with that number).

E) Include the information of C and D in the citation whether or not it conforms to any given style.

Perhaps this process is too rational or, more likely, there is a fear that a demand for too much information [content] in citation forms would be generated by this procedure. This fear is unfounded for two reasons:

1) In general there are not many more types of access information than author, title, publisher, date. And, 2) when bibliographic tools indicate a need for additional or different access information, it is because the nature of the material presents recognizable problems of location--i.e., government documents.

B. NEED FOR GENERAL STATEMENTS ON CONTENT

Librarians, who know how to make access easy, are themselves

not always rational. After all, knowing innately (as they should) the type of content necessary to good citation, librarians cannot always inform a patron as to what considerations should go into good citation. This is no wonder since bibliographic citation theory is generally ignored in library schools. The librarian's answer to any problem on citation is to consult a style manual for reference. When opened, the style manual will either give no general statement on content (relying on the implications of specific examples) or it will provide a content statement limited by style considerations. In both cases, an adequate explanation, one which explains the necessity of each piece of information, is not forthcoming.

1. PURPOSE OF GENERAL STATEMENTS OR GUIDELINES

The purpose of general statements on content is to give a reason why any bit or piece of information should be included in a citation at all; or conversely, why any information should be left out or contracted. For example, rather than stating that the author goes in such and/or such a position in the citation form, the following type of explanation should be given, perhaps in more detail: The author is included in the citation in the _____ position because the author's name can be used as a point of entry into a card catalog having author headings. It is also used for entry into several other bibliographic tools which have an author/name index. Therefore, the author's name will help any reader locate the source to be cited in addition to providing one of the distinguishing characteristics which further identifies this source from other,

possibly similar, sources.

This kind of statement is not found in any of the style manuals considered here.

2. GUIDELINES AND DIFFICULT DECISION

Although the author statement is relatively easy to capsulize, other information statements take much forethought. Indeed, the ways and means of access and the types of formats to be cited are changing as fast as the technology that produces them. Unfortunately, the style manuals appear to be far behind the technology.

a. MICROFORMS, NEW FORMATS, COMPUTER ACCESS

In considering microforms as a separate format, only Turabian (A Manual) makes any provision for citing them.

> References to micropublications that are republications of earlier published material should give the relevant facts of the original publication--if available--plus the facts concerning the micropublisher and the publication order number. ...References to works published only in microform should give the facts of publication for the micropublisher and the publication order number.
>
> Godwin C. Chu and Wilbur Schramm, Learning from Television: What the Research Says (Bethesda, Md. : ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 014 900, 1967).
>
> U.S., Congress, House, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Passenger Train Service, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics on H.R. 17849 and S. 3706, 91st Cong., 2d sess., 1970 (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Information Service, 500 Montgomery Building, CIS H501-33, 1970).[28]

Why it is advisable to include content about the microform format is not explained. The writer/researcher is simply told to do it. Curiously, the examples that Turabian (A Manual) furnishes are U.S. Government Publications. However, the index to Turabian

(A Manual) makes no cross-reference from public documents to microforms. Unless the writer/researcher knows that microform formats, according to Turabian (A Manual), require additional content in the citation, he or she will most likely cite a microform government publication as a hard copy publication. This of course, will force a future reader interested in relocating the document to discover--by taking extra steps in the search--the discrepancy (particularly if the publication is only available in microform--for example a Committee Print made available by Greenwood Press). Certainly the writer/researcher is not yet expected to realize that microforms deserve special attention since none of the other well-known style manuals mention microform citation (and it is not taught in the schools). Nonetheless, microforms need special citation content. After all, when one uses a microform as a source and then identifies, distinguishes, and locates it in a citation as a hard copy, it is not identified, distinguished or located correctly. A microform is not a hard copy!

This fact becomes increasingly important when one realizes that microforms are most often copies. Copies are subject to error(s). The possible mistakes are numerous. Among the many examples are pages out of sequence; the final version was not the copied version; the change sheet [errata] never came out in microcopy; the document was put under the wrong series title in the microform version; etc.

For the legal profession, copies or unofficial versions of an official publication are viewed traditionally with a wary eye.

Mistakes can create legal problems and complexities if they are relied upon for authority. Consequently, lawyers are told,

> In legal documents, it is always necessary to cite the official publication, and if the unofficial version is also cited, the official citation must come first.[29] [underlining added]

By citing the official publication, the lawyer accomplishes two things: 1) He or she is provided the backing of primary authority to any argument; and, 2) he or she gives the reader the impression that the official version, or an exact copy thereof, has been read thoroughly and accurately (subject to interpretation).

Unfortunately, most of the official publications are not available to lawyers. In fact, unofficial reporters, looseleaf services, microform reproductions, and computer full text services constitute the majority of available formats of publication--nearly all of them unofficial and the only ones available. Recognizing that these unofficial versions are the used versions, the Uniform System of Citation provides for the citing of these secondary sources--but not in microform [or computer-retrieved form].

As a result of this situation, lawyers (as readers) are given citations to unavailable official publications. They are forced to take several extra steps to realize that the official publication--a document--is available in some other format (microform, etc.) by an unofficial publisher. For documents librarians, this has lead to the following absurd common experience:

A) A member of a law journal enters the library to check up on citations used in an upcoming issue.

B) Cited correctly according to the Uniform System of Citation, the document cannot be easily located.

C) The law journal member and the librarian struggle to locate the document for too long a period (sometimes an hour or more). With luck, they locate the item (in microfiche format) and verify the citation.

D) Satisfied, the member of the law journal does not change the citation because it conforms with the "Bluebook."

E) Several months later, someone comes across the same citation after reading the article. The search begins again...only this time, the librarian--perhaps not as sharp (or lucky) as the first one--cannot locate the document.

None of the above should be taking place. It does, however, simply because there are no adequate guidelines for citing microforms, new and future formats, or computer stored and generated information.

Guidelines for citing any format must recognize both the purpose of citation and citation content. Therefore, the considerations for constructing a general statement include 1) giving reasons why certain information will identify, distinguish, and locate a source; 2) how that information will serve the reader in accessing the source; and, 3) how to determine what information will accomplish both 1 and 2 when dealing with material not already addressed in the manual.

It is this third point that must be focused upon. After all, it is not practical to write a new edition of a manual

every time a new format is created. For example, the new and developing COM formats will likely provide numerous citation problems in light of the present inadequacies of style manuals. This particular format(s) raises several questions. Should it be cited as a hard copy? If not, can it be cited as a microform even though it is not stored as a microform but is printed as an instant microform on demand? If it cannot be cited as a microform, can it be cited as a computer tape? How does one cite a computer tape? How is a computer tape accessed?

In the future, physically storing material on shelves or in files will not be necessary. Most items will be stored by various types of computer technology. A printed or non-print version will be made available on demand with the use of other compatible technologies. Already in many law libraries and firms LEXIS stores and makes available full text, searchable court cases which can be printed on demand. The Uniform System of Citation, however, gives no indication of how to cite this format. Consequently, a reader coming across a reference, perhaps an unreported U.S. District Court case acquired in this format, must guess how he or she can locate this physically (or so it seems) unavailable material. Does one go to the clerk of the court or through ILL? Or, does one realize by experience that this type of material is available via LEXIS? And, if one happens to know that LEXIS carries this material, how does one access it (perhaps not a problem in LEXIS--but for other systems it may be)? Is there some special information that would make the task easier?

B. UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL AND HARD TO GET MATERIAL

Very often researcher/writers gain access to unpublished or hard to get material. With regard to the unpublished material, they are instructed to indicate the unpublished nature of the source by placing quotation marks around the title and providing (optional) location information,[30] or writing out the word unpublished and the document's location in parentheses.[31] (Certainly most readers do not recognize quotation marks to mean unpublished). What is meant by unpublished, however, is not made clear in any of the manuals. Questions such as, "When is mimeographed or machine copied material considered published or unpublished?" are not answered. This, of course, is significant since more and more U.S. Government Publications are distributed in mimeographed or machine copied form.

With regard to hard to get materials, no provision is made. This creates havoc for documents librarians. The typical scenario is as follows:

A) A researcher/writer struggles to find the only available copy of a U.S. Government Publication issued by some agency (usually at some agency).

B) Using a style manual, the writer correctly cites the document as published or unpublished with citation content conforming to a prescribed style.

C) Since no style manual indicates that specific location information be given, the citation will make the document appear as though it should show up in the Monthly Catalog or other common bibliographic tools.

D) A reader, with the help of a librarian, will search all available bibliographic tools in order to locate the document and come up empty-handed.

E) As a last resort, after much wasted time, the librarian or reader calls the agency responsible for the publication as indicated in the citation.

F) No one at the agency can remember or locate the document. With some "run around" and exchange of information, the agency returns the call a day or two later--with or without result. The document does exist, but only in a specific office of a specific department within the agency.

What documents librarian is not in need of a toll-free line to every agency and department of government because of the impossibility of locating "well-cited" materials?

C. WHAT DOES ALL THIS MEAN FOR U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS?

Obviously, U.S. Government Publications are being handled with less than expert care by the style manuals. No clear theory of bibliographic citation is demonstrated in any of the manuals with regard to U.S. Documents. Certainly good theory is not always necessary to achieve practical results. In fact, theory is often the result of good practice. Therefore, at this point, one has to ask if the citation examples found in the manuals achieve the purpose of bibliographic citation through demonstration. In other words, in spite of the lack of good instruction in the manuals, do the examples provide, by implication, the necessary instruction to make excellent citations to U.S. Government Publications?

IV. CONGRESSIONAL PUBLICATIONS: comparing citations for content and accessibility

A. WHY CONGRESSIONAL PUBLICATIONS?

To test the adequacy of citation examples from the various manuals, selected types of Congressional publications have been chosen as formats for comparison. This is because the style manuals themselves indicate that these are among the most often cited publications. The premise here is that if the common citations are not handled properly--conform to the purpose of bibliographic citation with specific regard to the demands of U.S. Documents--then uncommon publications will likely be handled even less well.

B. BASIS OF COMPARISON

With the exception of GPO, which claims no citation authority and is therefore not included in the Tables, each style manual is compared on the basis of the following four sets of questions. (Each set represents a column in the Tables included in the Appendix).

Column I: How a type of Congressional publication is accessed through the index of the individual manual?

Column II: Whether there is an explanation of the type of document being cited or not. In other words, is there something in the nature of the document that makes it special and distinct from other documents and in what respect?

Column III: Is the type and amount of content required outright or implied by example? What content is included?

Column IV: According to the examples and content statements, how is a given document cited by all the respective manuals?

These comparisons are made in the following order: Citation Manual; A Uniform System of Citation; Chicago; Turabian (Student's Guide); Turabian (A Manual); LC; MLA.

Two types of Congressional publications are reviewed in this format: A) Committee Prints [Appendix, p. 1b] and B) Bills and Resolutions (Acts are also considered in this section since some manuals confuse Acts with Bills) [Appendix, p. 2b]. The Committee Print used for a citation example is on page 1a of the Appendix. The Bill used for a citation example is on page 2a of the Appendix.

C. THE RESULTS

With regard to Committee Prints, each column (set of questions) reveals the following information:

Column I: Only Citation Manual and A Uniform System of Citation list Committee Prints in their indexes. The remaining style manuals, with the exception of MLA, provide an example of a Committee Print(s) under some other heading. MLA does not deal with Committee Prints at all.

Column II: None of the style manuals explain what a Committee Print is, or how it differs from other documents. Only Citation Manual and A Uniform System of Citation treat Committee Prints as a distinct and separate type of document. LC makes a distinction on the basis of the title page indicating "Committee Print."

Column III: Only Citation Manual and A Uniform System of Citation state directly what content should be included in a citation to a Committee Print. The remaining style manuals, with the exception of MLA, imply by example what content should be included. (Some examples actually conflict. This is not shown in the Tables since

the best example of any given manual was used for the sake of simplicity). MLA does not include an example.

Column IV: With the exception of MLA, which provides no guidance for citing a Committee Print, all the style manuals provide some sort of citation format. Of these, Chicago does not indicate in its format that a Committee Print is being cited. Both Chicago and A Uniform System of Citation apparently permit the deletion of the subtitle or title extension phrase for the sake of brevity. (This is ascertained if one bothers to look their examples up). In this case, a shortened title could be inadequate to distinguish this document from other similar ones.

Other Comments: None of the style manuals indicate that this particular Committee Print can be found in CIS, available in microfiche copy (CIS, 1977:H962-12) or in the Monthly Catalog (MC 78-16270) which would lead to a Sudoc number (Y4.N16:95-1-3) or to a Readex Microprint copy. Since it is not likely that many libraries would catalog this type of document, the citation forms suggested by the manuals does not point the way to easy access.

With regard to Bills and Resolutions (and Acts) each column (set of questions) reveals the following information:

Column I: Citation Manual, A Uniform System of Citation, Turabian (Student's Guide), Turabian (A Manual), and LC list Bills and/or Resolutions in their indexes. However, Citation Manual considers Acts to be the same as Bills (which they are not). Turabian (Student's Guide), although it lists Bills in its index, it gives no example of a Bill. MLA mentions Bills only in part and listed in

the index as "Acts of government." Chicago does not include Bills.

Column II: None of the style manuals explain what a Bill is, or how it differs from other documents. Only Turabian (A Manual) indicates that as a Bill changes form, so must the citation to it.

Column III: Only Citation Manual and LC state directly what content should be included in a citation to a Bill or Resolution. Chicago, Turabian (Student's Guide), and MLA give no examples of Bills or Resolutions. Turabian (A Manual) confuses, at one point, a Slip Bill with a Slip Law.

Column IV: Only four of the manuals provide a citation format--Citation Manual, A Uniform System of Citation, Turabian (A Manual), and LC.

Other Comments: None of the style manuals indicate that this particular Bill is available in GPO microfiche format, or that it is included, in its full text, in a hearing available from CIS (CIS, 1979: S 201-14) or from GPO (Monthly Catalog entry number 79-17432, Sudoc number Y4.Ar 5/3: M 59/17). Of course, this type of information may or may not be known at the time the Bill is cited. However, if this location information is known, why should it be excluded as the style manuals permit? After all, until the recent GPO microfiche format for Bills became available, few libraries maintained the thousands of Bills for each session of Congress. Consequently, Bills, in slip form, were not (and in most places still not) available for previous Congresses.

Do these differences demonstrate a need for standardization? Not necessarily.

V. SUGGESTION FOR A GENERAL STATEMENT ON CITATION CONTENT

If all of the above-mentioned style manuals had included the following general statement, location content would have been improved to the degree that a need for standardization would not be perceived. After all, it is not necessary to have a "perfect" or even "best" citation. All that is needed is a citation that functions properly--identifies, distinguishes, and LOCATES.

The suggested statement:

> Follow the general rules, principles and guidelines given for the citing of U.S. Government Publications as provided in this manual [the one being used]. When all the instructions have been complied with, ask yourself the following question. "If I wanted to <u>easily</u> locate this document from the citation I have just written, would I need additional information such as a <u>Monthly Catalog</u> entry number, a microfiche publisher name and microfiche access number, a Sudocs classification number, a specific location of availability, etc.?" If so, include this information in parentheses at the end of the citation. If it is not clear to you what location information would be helpful and you recognize a need for such information, ask a documents librarian for assistance.

VI. CONCLUSION

Bibliographic citation formats for U.S. Government Publications (as recommended by style manuals--at least the eight examined) tend to be inadequate in the following respects:

1) They emphasize style--which is presumably pleasing to the manual's clientele--to the neglect, often, of adequate location content.

2) What location information is included in the citation form seems to be geared to the use of a library card catalog. This neglects the use of new bibliographic tools and/or tools specifically designed to aid in the retrieval of U.S. Government Documents.

3) New document formats (microfiche, etc.) are neglected by the stylized citations. This often misleads researchers and librarians into believing that the sought after source is in hard copy. (Only Turabian (A Manual) provides a format for citing microforms. Unfortunately, this citation form is not cross-referenced with public documents in the index).

4) No provisions are made in the citation forms for inclusion of information that would lead to difficult-to-retrieve material.

The style manuals themselves demonstrate the following deficiencies aside from recommending inadequate citation forms:

1) No style manual explains the differences among the various types of documents. Consequently, the purpose in including the content that they do recommend is lost. They provide no answer to the question, "Why must I cite it [the document] this way?"

2) All the style manuals demonstrate, in one respect or another, a lack of understanding of either the problems associated with

U.S. Documents or the nature, purpose, function, and/or legal significance of certain specific types of documents.

3) None of the style manuals is attempting to keep up with the changing formats for U.S. Documents. A look toward the future is not reflected in any of the style manuals; and, guidelines which could aid researchers in confronting these changes are not provided.

4) Writers of style manuals apparently do not consult librarians for advice, or they have been poorly advised with regard to U.S. Government Publications.

Standardization of citation forms, though desired by many librarians and researchers alike, is not necessary. What is necessary is content which easily locates a document.

Complete bibliographic control and retrieval is not yet in sight. But, better citations for U.S. Government Publications would be a major step in that direction.

APPENDIX

[COMMITTEE PRINT]

95TH CONGRESS
1st Session
} HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APPENDIX

SUBMISSIONS FOR THE RECORD

PURSUANT TO

OVERSIGHT HEARINGS ON CURRENT FEDERAL AND INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL EFFORTS

NINETY-FIFTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

SCNAC-95-1-3

FEBRUARY 1977

Printed for the use of the
Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
81-443 WASHINGTON : 1977

found in index; listed as Committee Prints, Congressional, page 24	no explanation offered; however, given special treatment as separate and distinct document	stated; U.S. Congress House (or Senate) Name of Committee Title Secondary author if any "Committee Print" or "Joint Committee Print" Serial number if any Place of Publication Publisher Year of Publication	U.S. Congress. House. Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control. Appendix. Submissions for the record pursuant to oversight hearings on current federal and international narcotics control efforts. Committee Print (95-1-3). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1977.
found in index; listed as Committee prints, Congressional, page 63	no explanation offered; however, indicates need for separate citation form implying they are distinct from other documents	stated; Institutional Author Congress and Session number are part of the author's name Title "Committee Print" Year of Publication	HOUSE SELECT COMM. ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL, 95th CONG. 1st SESS., APPENDIX (Comm. Print 1977)
not found in index; however, is included under Reports and Hearings on page 295 at 17.22	no explanation offered; no distinction is made between committee prints and other documents	implied; U.S. Congress House (or Senate) Name of Committee Title Number and Session of Congress Year of Publication Pages for footnote Actual example shortens the title to the extent that it cannot be distinguished from a similar publication on the basis of title alone No designation given to identify the document as a "Committee Print"	U. S., Congress, House, Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control. Appendix. 95th Cong., 1st sess. 1977.
not found in index; however, is included under Reports and Hearings on pages 142-43 at 7.115	no explanation offered; no distinction made between committee prints and other documents	implied; U.S. Congress Name of Committee Title Secondary Author if any "Committee Print" or "Joint Committee Print" Serial Number if any Place of Publication Publisher Year of Publication Pages (for footnote)	U.S. Congress. Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control. Appendix. Committee Print, SCNAC-95-1-3. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office. 1977.
not found in index; however, is included under Bills, Reports, and Miscellaneous Documents on pages 145-46 at 9.1	no explanation offered; no distinction is made between committee prints and other documents	implied; U.S. Congress Name of Committee Title Secondary Author if any "Committee Print" or "Joint Committee Print" Serial Number if any Place of Publication Publisher Year of Publication Pages (for footnote)	U.S. Congress. Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control. Appendix. Committee Print, SCNAC-95-1-3. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.
not found in index; however, is included under Corporate Author on page 69 and on page 70 at 7.	no explanation offered; distinction made only as per title page	implied; U.S. Title Name of Committee(s) Place of Publication Publisher Year of Publication Number of Pages Classification Number Number and session of Congress "Committee Print"	United States. Appendix: submissions for the record pursuant to oversight hearings on current federal and international narcotics control efforts. Printed for the use of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1977. 629p. At head of title: 95th Cong. 1st sess. House Committee Print.
not found in index. not included	no explanation offered; however, it appears to a uniform [illegible] only if reader [illegible] to a legal document as opposed to a government document	not applicable	not applicable

Calendar No. 240

96TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. 109

[Report No. 96–226]

To require the reinstitution of procedures for the registration of certain persons under the Military Selective Service Act, and for other purposes.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 23 (legislative day, JANUARY 15), 1979

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, Jr. (for himself, Mr. NUNN, Mr. CHILES, and Mr. CANNON) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Armed Services

JUNE 19 (legislative day, MAY 21), 1979

Reported by Mr. NUNN, with an amendment to the text of the bill and an amendment to the title

[Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the part printed in italic]

A BILL

To require the reinstitution of procedures for the registration of certain persons under the Military Selective Service Act, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

...und in index; listed separately as ...ills, Acts, Resolutions located on ...ge 19	no explanation offered	stated: U.S. Congress House (or Senate) Bill, Act, or Resolution number; Title Number of Congress Session Year of Session Does not make a distinction between Acts and Bills/Resolutions, nor does it give an example of an Act.	U.S. Congress. Senate. S. 109, A bill to require the reinstitution of procedures for the registration of certain persons under the Military Selective Service Act, and for other purposes. 96th Congress, 1st Session, 1979.

2b

found in index; listed as follows: Acts (see "Codes", "Session laws", "Statutes"] Bills and resolutions, 61-62 Resolutions--congressional), 61-62	no explanation offered	implied: House (or Senate, etc.) Bill, Act, or Resolution number Number of Congress Session Year of Session Provisions made for numerous exceptions; recognizes Act as separate by definition	S. 109 96th Cong. 1st Session (1979).
not found in index	some explanation under the heading Statutory Material given on page 301	partly stated, partly left to "common sense": U.S. Congress House (or Senate) "common sense" There is no specific example of a Bill, Act, or Resolution	not applicable
found in index; listed as follows: Acts. See Statutory Material Bills. See Statutory Material Statutory Material, 7.113	no explanation offered	Bills, Acts, and Resolutions are, in fact, not found in this section. There is no specific example of any of the above.	not applicable
...und in index; listed as follows: Acts. See Statutory Materials ...ills. See Statutory Materials Statutory materials, 8.1-8.16, 9.5-13, 9.25-23. See also Public documents	no explanation offered: however, some explanation of the process a bill goes through is provided with some indication that on a bill changes form, so must the citation to the material.	implied; House (or Senate); sometimes title Bill or Resolution number Number of Congress Session Year of Session Distinguishes an Act as something separate with different citation requirements, but no definition or explanation given. At 9:9 after discussing a slip bill, an example of a slip law is given.	S. 109, 96th Cong. 1st sess. (1979). [on 6:131]
...ound in index; listed as follows: ...ills, legislative, 71-72 ...esolutions, legislative, 71-72	no explanation offered	stated; U.S. Subject indicator or Congress, Chamber Title Bill or Resolution number Number of Congress Session	U.S. Congress. Senate. A bill to require the reinstitution of procedures for the registration of certain persons under the Military Selective Service Act, and for other purposes. S. 109, 96th Cong. 1st sess. [Washington, Govt. Print Off., 1979]
...ound in index, listed as follows: ...cts of government, see government publication; and legal references ...overnment publications, U.S., 42 ...egal references, U.S.	no explanation offered	stated in part; U.S. Congress House (or Senate) Bill or Resolution number Number of Congress Session Place, publisher, date No example of a Bill or Resolution	not applicable

NOTES

[1]Kate L. Turabian, Student's Guide for Writing College Papers, 3d ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976), p. 49.

[2]U. S. Library of Congress. Reference Department. General Reference and Bibliography Division, Bibliographical Procedures & Style, by Blanche Prichard McCrum and Helen Dudenbostel Jones, (Washington, D. C.: U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1954), p. 7.

[3]Modern Language Association, MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations, (New York: Modern Language Association, 1977), p. 49.

[4]A Manual of Style, 12th ed., rev., (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969), p. 40.

[5]Also, the style manuals themselves either state or imply that there is a retrieval problem.

[6]Turabian, Student's Guide, p. 145.

[7]Ibid. p. 32.

[8]Kate L. Turabian, A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations, 4th ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973), p. 144.

[9]Ibid., pp. 144-145.

[10]Ibid., p. 145.

[11]Ibid., p. 146.

[12]Ibid., p. 81.

[13]Ibid., A Manual of Style, pp. 389-390

[14]Ibid., p. 390.

[15]Ibid., p. 395.

[16]George D. Brightbill and Wayne C. Maxson, Citation Manual for United States Government Publications, (Philadelphia: Center for the Study of Federalism, Temple University, 1974), p. iii.

[17]Ibid., p. iii.

[18]U.S. Government Printing Office, U.S. Government Printing Office Style Manual, rev. ed., (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1973), p. 9.

[19]Ibid., p. 9.

[20]Ibid., p. 9.

[21]Ibid., p. V.

[22]Ibid., MLA Handbook, p. 49.

[23]Ibid., pp. 69-70.

[24]Ibid., Bibliographic Procedures & Style, p. 7.

[25]Ibid., p. 69.

[26]Ibid., A Manual of Style, p. 395.

[27]Ibid., p. 395.

[28]Ibid., Turabian, A Manual, pp. 109-110.

[29]Morris L. Cohen, ed., How to Find the Law, 7th ed., (St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Co., 1976), p. 4.

[30]Ibid., Turabian, A Manual, pp. 141-142.

[31]The Columbia Law Review et al., A Uniform System of Citation, 12th ed., (Cambridge, Mass.: The Harvard Law Review Association, 1976), pp. 79, 84.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brightbill, George D. and Maxson, Wayne C. Citation Manual for United States Government Publications. Philadelphia: Center for the Study of Federalism, Temple University, 1974. (also ERIC, ED 103 027)

Cohen, Morris L., ed. How to Find the Law, 7th ed. St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Co., 1976.

The Columbia Law Review, The Harvard Law Review Association, The University of Pennsylvania Law Review, and The Yale Law Journal. A Uniform System of Citation, 12th ed. Cambridge, Mass.: The Harvard Law Review Association, 1976.

A Manual of Style, 12th ed., rev. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

Modern Language Association. MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations. New York: Modern Language Association, 1977.

Turabian, Kate L. A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations, 4th ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.

Turabian, Kate L. Student's Guide for Writing College Papers, 3d ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.

U.S. Government Printing Office. U.S. Government Printing Office Style Manual, rev. ed. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1973 (also MC 73-25263)

U.S. Library of Congress. Reference Department. General Reference and Bibliography Division. Bibliographical Procedures & Style, by Blanche Prichard McCrum and Helen Dudenbostel Jones. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1954. (also MC 54-10651; LC 2.8: B 47/954)